

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

CINDY L. GRANT,

CV 04-129-HU

Plaintiff,

ORDER

v.

SOLOFLEX, INC., an Oregon
corporation, JERRY WILSON
and MARILYN WILSON,

Defendants.

STEPHEN L. BRISCHETTO
520 S.W. Yamhill Street, Suite 500
Portland, OR 97204
(503) 223-5814

Attorney for Plaintiff

STEVE D. LARSON
EMILY S. COURTNAGE
Stoll Stoll Berne Lokting & Shlachter P.C.
209 S.W. Oak Street, Fifth Floor
Portland, OR 97204
(503) 227-1600

Attorneys for Defendants

BROWN, Judge.

Magistrate Judge Dennis James Hubel issued Findings and Recommendation (#89) on March 1, 2005, in which he recommended the Court deny Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (#29). Defendants filed timely objections to the Findings and Recommendation. The matter is now before this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b).

When any party objects to any portion of the Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendation, the district court must make a *de novo* determination of that portion of the Magistrate Judge's report. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). *See also United States v. Bernhardt*, 840 F.2d 1441, 1444 (9th Cir. 1988); *McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Commodore Business Machines, Inc.*, 656 F.2d 1309, 1313 (9th Cir. 1981), *cert. denied*, 455 U.S. 920 (1982). This Court has reviewed the pertinent portions of the record *de novo* and finds no error in the Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendation.

CONCLUSION

The Court **ADOPTS** Magistrate Judge Hubel's Findings and Recommendation (#89) and, accordingly, **DENIES** Defendants' Motion

for Summary Judgment (#29).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 16th day of May, 2005.

/s/ Anna J. Brown

ANNA J. BROWN
United States District Judge

Grant CV 04-129 F&R.05-16-05.wpd